UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/812,417	03/30/2004	Sumit Agarwal	64557.000020 GP-254-00-US	1265

21967 7590 06/18/2007		

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
1900 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109

EXAMINER
PHAM, MICHAEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 March 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 3-35* is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 3-35* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *3/2/07*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Status of claims

1. Claims 3-35 are pending.

2. Claims 1 and 29-35 have been amended and claim 2 has been cancelled.

Specification

3. Prior objection is withdrawn.

Information Disclosure Statement

4.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 3/2/07 was filed after the

mailing date of the non-final action on 10/2/06. The submission is in compliance with the

provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being

considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6.   **Claim 1, 4, 7, 10, 17, 18, and 24 – 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being**

anticipated by Hillis et al. (hereinafter Hillis, US 2005/0131918).

<u>Claim 1:</u>

Hillis discloses the following claimed limitations:

"selecting a plurality of evaluators to rate the document;" [0019, a rating system in which

a client queries a plurality of evaluation systems, according to an alternative embodiment of the

a client queries a plurality of evaluation systems. 0027, further discloses the evaluation profile

indicates which evaluation systems should be queried and how the ratings returned by the

evaluation systems should be combined to determine the combined rating. That is, evaluation

profile indicates which evaluation systems should be queried suggests the claimed "selecting a

plurality of evaluators" and ratings returned by the evaluation systems suggests the claimed

"evaluators to rate a document".]

"passing the document to the plurality of evaluators for rating;" [0019, as in fig. 1, a

client 200 is communicatively coupled to a content server 500 to which it submits request for

content and from which it receives content.. Further disclosing 0048, the evaluation system

managed by the Centers for Disease control has not evaluated the article, and therefore does not

return a rating. Hence, Hillis suggests that a document must be passed to an evaluator system in

order to rate a document. Otherwise, a rating is not returned. Ergo, Hillis discloses "passing a

the document" (e.g. content is not rated unless an article is received by the evaluator system as

disclosed as the evaluation system managed by Centers for Disease control has not evaluated the

article, and therefore does not return a rating.) "to the plurality of evaluators for rating" (e.g.

other evaluator systems are able to provide a rating)];

"receiving rating information associated with a document from one or more
evaluators;"[0028, each of the evaluation systems that have evaluated the content interest returns
a rating, preferably numeric.]

"receiving a signal relevant to a criteria; and" [0026, Alternatively, for certain types of
content, it may be inferred from the request for the content that the user wishes to determine a
rating. Receiving a signal is interpreted by the examiner as being a request for a document.]

"determining whether to deliver the document in response to the signal based on the
criteria and the rating information from the one or more evaluators." [0042, content for which a
combined rating cannot be determined and content for which a rating can be determined, but
where the rating does not meet a threshold set by the user, is not displayed by the client]

Claim 4:

Hillis discloses "determining an aggregate rating based on the rating information, wherein the
action of determining whether to deliver the document is further based on the aggregate rating of
the document." [paragraph 30, the ratings may be combined by any number of methods. In the
case of numerical values, the ratings may be combined in an averaging scheme, preferably a
weighted averaging scheme, in which the user values the opinion of the evaluation authority that
manages each evaluation system. Medians and modes may be computed to discern a consensus

among the evaluation systems.]

Claim 7:

Hillis discloses

"identifying at least one trust score, wherein each trust score" (weights) "is associated with a specific one of a plurality of evaluators;" (evaluation authorities) [0030, in which the weights reflect the relative degree to which the user values the opinion of the evaluation authority that manages each evaluation system.]

"determining an aggregate rating based on the rating information and the at least one trust score, wherein determining whether to deliver the document is further based on the aggregate rating." [0030, in the case of numerical values, the ratings may be combined by an averaging scheme, preferably a weighted averaging scheme...]

Claim 10:

Hillis discloses "wherein at least one trust score" (weightings) "is based on an industry associated with the associated specific one of the plurality of evaluators. "[0050, Specifically, the evaluation profile indicates that the evaluation system managed by the American Medical Association has a weighting of 15, the evaluation system managed by the Centers for Disease Control has a weighting of 7... These are examples of industry specific evaluators]

Claim 17:

Hillis discloses "wherein the document comprises at least one of a web page, content that can be used in a web page, and a program." [0005, Many sites found on the World Wide Web allow users to evaluate content found within the site]

Claim 18:

Hillis discloses, "further comprising the action of selecting a plurality of evaluators to evaluate the document." [0019, ...a rating system in which a client queries a plurality of evaluation systems, according to an alternative embodiment of the invention. And 0022, Generally, the ratings obtained from the evaluation systems indicate the value of the content, as judged by an evaluation authority that manages the evaluation system. An evaluation authority may be commercial, such as the American Medical Association, or may be private such as a peer of the user or the user himself.]

Claim 24:

Hillis discloses, "wherein the aggregate rating comprises a quantity." [0010, In the preferred embodiment of the invention, the rating obtained from each evaluation system is a numeric value.]

Claim 25:

Hillis discloses, "wherein the aggregate rating comprises a mean of the rating information." [0010, discloses means, and 0030, the ratings may be combined by any number of methods. In the case of numerical values, the ratings may be combined in an averaging scheme, preferably a

weighted averaging scheme, in which the user values the opinion of the evaluation authority that manages each evaluation system. Medians and modes may be computed to discern a consensus among the evaluation systems.]

Claim 26:

Hillis discloses, "wherein the aggregate rating comprises a mode of the rating information." [0010, discloses means, and 0030, the ratings may be combined by any number of methods. In the case of numerical values, the ratings may be combined in an averaging scheme, preferably a weighted averaging scheme, in which the user values the opinion of the evaluation authority that manages each evaluation system. Medians and modes may be computed to discern a consensus among the evaluation systems.]

Claim 27:

Hillis discloses, "wherein the aggregate rating comprises a median of the rating information. " [0010, discloses means, and 0030, the ratings may be combined by any number of methods. In the case of numerical values, the ratings may be combined in an averaging scheme, preferably a weighted averaging scheme, in which the user values the opinion of the evaluation authority that manages each evaluation system. Medians and modes may be computed to discern a consensus among the evaluation systems.]

Claim 28:

Hillis discloses "wherein the request is received by at least one of a content provider and a user."

[0022, an evaluation authority may be commercial, such as the American medical association, or may be private, such as a peer of the user or the user himself. Here, the request to rate the document is sent to the user.]

Claim 29:

Hillis discloses the following claimed limitations:

"select a plurality of evaluators to rate the document;" [0019, a rating system in which a client queries a plurality of evaluation systems, according to an alternative embodiment of the a client queries a plurality of evaluation systems. 0027, further discloses the evaluation profile indicates which evaluation systems should be queried and how the ratings returned by the evaluation systems should be combined to determine the combined rating. That is, evaluation profile indicates which evaluation systems should be queried suggests the claimed "selecting a plurality of evaluators" and ratings returned by the evaluation systems suggests the claimed "evaluators to rate a document".]

"pass the document to the plurality of evaluators for rating;" [0019, as in fig. 1, a client 200 is communicatively coupled to a content server 500 to which it submits request for content and from which it receives content.. Further disclosing 0048, the evaluation system managed by the Centers for Disease control has not evaluated the article, and therefore does not return a rating. Hence, Hillis suggests that a document must be passed to an evaluator system in order to rate a document. Otherwise, a rating is not returned. Ergo, Hillis discloses "passing a the document" (e.g. content is not rated unless an article is recieved by the evaluator system as disclosed as the evaluation system managed by Centers for Disease control has not evaluated the

article, and therefore does not return a rating.) "to the plurality of evaluators for rating" (e.g.

other evaluator systems are able to provide a rating)]

"receive rating information associated with a document from one or more evaluators;"

[0028, each of the evaluation systems that have evaluated the content interest returns a rating,

preferably numeric.]

"receive a signal relevant to a criteria; and" [0026, Alternatively, for certain types of

content, it may be inferred from the request for the content that the user wishes to determine a

rating. Receiving a signal is interpreted by the examiner as being a request for a document.]

"determine whether to deliver the document in response to the signal based on the criteria

and the rating information from the one or more evaluators." [0042, ..content for which a

combined rating cannot be determined and content for which a rating can be determined, but

where the rating does not meet a threshold set by the user, is not displayed by the client]

Claim 30:

Hillis discloses the following claimed limitations:

"selecting means for a plurality of evaluators to rate the document;" [0019, a rating

system in which a client queries a plurality of evaluation systems, according to an alternative

embodiment of the a client queries a plurality of evaluation systems. 0027, further discloses the

evaluation profile indicates which evaluation systems should be queried and how the ratings

returned by the evaluation systems should be combined to determine the combined rating. That

is, evaluation profile indicates which evaluation systems should be queried suggests the claimed

"selecting a plurality of evaluators" and ratings returned by the evaluation systems suggests the

claimed "evaluators to rate a document".]

"passing means for the document to the plurality of evaluators for rating;" [0019, as in

fig. 1, a client 200 is communicatively coupled to a content server 500 to which it submits

request for content and from which it receives content.. Further disclosing 0048, the evaluation

system managed by the Centers for Disease control has not evaluated the article, and therefore

does not return a rating. Hence, Hillis shows that a document must be passed to an evaluator

system in order to rate a document. Otherwise, a rating is not returned. Ergo, Hillis discloses

"passing a the document" (e.g. content is not rated unless an article is received by the evaluator

system as disclosed as the evaluation system managed by Centers for Disease control has not

evaluated the article, and therefore does not return a rating.) "to the plurality of evaluators for

rating" (e.g. other evaluator systems are able to provide a rating)]

"rating receiving means for receiving rating information associated with a document from

one or more evaluators;" [0028, each of the evaluation systems that have evaluated the content

interest returns a rating, preferably numeric.]

"signal receiving means for receiving a signal relevant to a criteria; and" [0026,

Alternatively, for certain types of content, it may be inferred from the request for the content that

the user wishes to determine a rating. Receiving a signal is interpreted by the examiner as being

a request for a document.]

"determination means for determining whether to deliver the document in response to the

signal based on the criteria and the rating information from the one or more evaluators." [0042,

content for which a combined rating cannot be determined and content for which a rating can be

determined, but where the rating does not meet a threshold set by the user, is not displayed by the client]

Claim 31:

Hillis discloses the following claimed limitations:

"a selecting device that selects a plurality of evaluators to rate the document;" [0019, a rating system in which a client queries a plurality of evaluation systems, according to an alternative embodiment of the a client queries a plurality of evaluation systems. 0027, further discloses the evaluation profile indicates which evaluation systems should be queried and how the ratings returned by the evaluation systems should be combined to determine the combined rating. That is, evaluation profile indicates which evaluation systems should be queried suggests the claimed "selecting a plurality of evaluators" and ratings returned by the evaluation systems suggests the claimed "evaluators to rate a document".]

"a passing device that passes the document to the plurality of evaluators for rating;" [0019, as in fig. 1, a client 200 is communicatively coupled to a content server 500 to which it submits request for content and from which it receives content.. Further disclosing 0048, the evaluation system managed by the Centers for Disease control has not evaluated the article, and therefore does not return a rating. Hence, Hillis shows that a document must be passed to an evaluator system in order to rate a document. Otherwise, a rating is not returned. Ergo, Hillis suggests "passing a the document" (e.g. content is not rated unless an article is received by the evaluator system as disclosed as the evaluation system managed by Centers for Disease control has not evaluated the article, and therefore does not return a rating.) "to the plurality of

evaluators for rating" (e.g. other evaluator systems are able to provide a rating)]

"a rating receiving device that receives rating information associated with a document

from one or more evaluators;" [0028, each of the evaluation systems that have evaluated the

content interest returns a rating, preferably numeric.]

"a signal receiving device that receives a signal relevant to a criteria; and" [0026,

Alternatively, for certain types of content, it may be inferred from the request for the content that

the user wishes to determine a rating. Receiving a signal is interpreted by the examiner as being

a request for a document.]

"a determination device that determines whether to deliver the document in response to

the signal based on the criteria and the rating information from the one or more evaluators."

[0042, content for which a combined rating cannot be determined and content for which a rating

can be determined, but where the rating does not meet a threshold set by the user, is not

displayed by the client]

Claim 32:

Hillis discloses the following claimed limitations:

"selecting a plurality of evaluators to rate the document;"[0019, a rating system in which

a client queries a plurality of evaluation systems, according to an alternative embodiment of the

a client queries a plurality of evaluation systems. 0027, further discloses the evaluation profile

indicates which evaluation systems should be queried and how the ratings returned by the

evaluation systems should be combined to determine the combined rating. That is, evaluation

profile indicates which evaluation systems should be queried suggests the claimed "selecting a

plurality of evaluators" and ratings returned by the evaluation systems suggests the claimed

"evaluators to rate a document".]

"passing the document to the plurality of evaluators for rating;"[0019, as in fig. 1, a client

200 is communicatively coupled to a content server 500 to which it submits request for content

and from which it receives content.. Further disclosing 0048, the evaluation system managed by

the Centers for Disease control has not evaluated the article, and therefore does not return a

rating. Hence, Hillis shows that a document must be passed to an evaluator system in order to

rate a document. Otherwise, a rating is not returned. Ergo, Hillis suggests "passing a the

document" (e.g. content is not rated unless an article is received by the evaluator system as

disclosed as the evaluation system managed by Centers for Disease control has not evaluated the

article, and therefore does not return a rating.) "to the plurality of evaluators for rating" (e.g.

other evaluator systems are able to provide a rating)]

"receiving rating information for an electronic document from a plurality of

evaluators,"[0028, each of the evaluation systems that have evaluated the content interest returns

a rating, preferably numeric.] "wherein at least one evaluator is associated with a trust score; and

"[0030, ...in which the weights reflect the relative degree to which the user values the opinion of

the evaluation authority that manages each evaluation system.]

"determining an aggregate content rating for the electronic document by aggregating the

rating information from at least two of the plurality of evaluators," [0030, The ratings may be

combined by any number of methods. In the case of numerical values, the ratings may be

combined in an averaging scheme, preferably a weighted averaging scheme, in which the user

values the opinion of the evaluation authority that manages each evaluation system. Medians

and modes may be computed to discern a consensus among the evaluation systems.] "wherein

the rating information for at least one evaluator is considered in association with the trust score

for that evaluator. "[0030, ...in which the weights reflect the relative degree to which the user

values the opinion of the evaluation authority that manages each evaluation system.]

Claim 33:

Hillis discloses the following claimed limitations:

"transmitting a signal to a server, the server interpreting the signal as being associated

with a criteria for a document" [0026, alternatively, for certain types of content, it may be

inferred from the request for the content that the user wishes to determine a rating. Receiving a

signal is interpreted as being a request for a document] "and determining whether a document is

to be delivered based in part on transmitting the document to a plurality of evaluators and rating

information received from the plurality of evaluators for one or more documents and whether the

one or more documents relate to the criteria; and " [0042, ...content for which a combined rating

cannot be determined and content for which a rating can be determined, but where the rating

does not meet a threshold set by the user, is not displayed by the client. As to transmitting the

document to a plurality of evaluators this new limitation is rejected under similar grounds as

above for passing the document to the plurality of evaluators for rating.]

"receiving a document in response to the signal. "[0042]

Claim 34:

Hillis discloses the following claimed limitations:

"selecting a plurality of evaluators to rate the document;"[0019, a rating system in which

a client queries a plurality of evaluation systems, according to an alternative embodiment of the

a client queries a plurality of evaluation systems. 0027, further discloses the evaluation profile

indicates which evaluation systems should be queried and how the ratings returned by the

evaluation systems should be combined to determine the combined rating. That is, evaluation

profile indicates which evaluation systems should be queried suggests the claimed "selecting a

plurality of evaluators" and ratings returned by the evaluation systems suggests the claimed

"evaluators to rate a document".]

"passing the document to the plurality of evaluators for rating;" [0019, as in fig. 1, a

client 200 is communicatively coupled to a content server 500 to which it submits request for

content and from which it receives content.. Further disclosing 0048, the evaluation system

managed by the Centers for Disease control has not evaluated the article, and therefore does not

return a rating. Hence, Hillis shows that a document must be passed to an evaluator system in

order to rate a document. Otherwise, a rating is not returned. Ergo, Hillis suggests "passing a

the document" (e.g. content is not rated unless an article is received by the evaluator system as

disclosed as the evaluation system managed by Centers for Disease control has not evaluated the

article, and therefore does not return a rating.) "to the plurality of evaluators for rating" (e.g.

other evaluator systems are able to provide a rating)]

"receiving one or more documents from a server system; and"[0019, a client 200 is

communicatively coupled to a content server 500 to which it submits request for content and

from which it receives content]

"providing rating information to the server system for use by the server system" [0028,

each of the evaluation systems that have evaluated the content of interest returns a rating,

preferably numeric.] "in determining whether to deliver the one or more documents in response

to requests for the one or more documents based on the rating provided." [0042 ...content for

which a combined rating cannot be determined and content for which a rating can be determined,

but where the rating does not meet a threshold set by the user, is not displayed by the client.]

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or
> described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject
> matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole
> would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary
> skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived
> by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   **Claims 3, 5, 6, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable**

over Hillis as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Dahlstrom et al. (hereinafter

Dahlstrom, US 2005/0144297).

<u>Claim 3:</u>

Hillis discloses the above method of claim 1 as noted above.

Hillis does not explicitly disclose "the signal is a request received from an entity, the entity is associated with a suitability standard, and the determining action comprises determining whether the document satisfies the suitability standard."

However, Dahlstrom teaches "the signal is a request received from an entity, the entity is associated with a suitability standard" [website is found to be appropriate], "and the determining action comprises determining whether the document satisfies the suitability standard." [See page 2, paragraph [0007] If the website is found to be appropriate for viewing based on the settings, the access request is sent to the computer network layering or protocol to which the original request was routed.]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Hillis with that of Dahlstrom because both are related to evaluating and regulating content on the internet and by including a suitability standard as disclosed in Dahlstrom, the ratings that are derived as disclosed in Hillis can be used to block access to inappropriate materials based on the standard for a particular user. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include the signal is a request received from an entity, the entity is associated with a suitability standard, and the determining action comprises determining whether the document satisfies the suitability standard.

Claim 5:

Hillis and Dahstrom discloses the above method of claim 3 as noted above.

Hillis does not explicitly teach "determining an aggregate rating based on the rating information; and selecting the electronic document based on the aggregate rating and the suitability standard."

However, Dahlstrom teaches "determining an aggregate rating based on the rating information; and selecting the electronic document based on the aggregate rating and the suitability standard." [See page 2, paragraph [0007] if the URL is found, a message including URL ratings for the website is sent to the client computer.... the client computer compares the URL ratings to the web access settings for the user attempting to access the Internet.]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Hillis with that of Dahlstrom because both are related to evaluating and regulating content on the internet and by including the addition of a suitability standard as disclosed in Dahlstrom, with the aggregate rating as disclosed in Hillis, appropriate relevant documents, based on the standard for a particular user, can be provided. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include determining an aggregate rating based on the rating information; and selecting the electronic document based on the aggregate rating and the suitability standard.

Claim 6:

Hillis and Dahstrom discloses the above method of claim 3 as noted above.

Hillis does not explicitly disclose, "storing the suitability standard in a database; and processing the database to determine the suitability standard."

However, Dahlstrom discloses, "storing the suitability standard in a database; and processing the database to determine the suitability standard." [See page 3, paragraph [0030] The cache 108 is preferably implemented as a text file or database that is stored in computer memory. And see page 3, paragraph [0031] the logic module 106 compares the URL ratings to the web access settings for the user attempting to access the Internet 101.]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Hillis with that of Dahlstrom because both are related to evaluating and regulating content on the internet and by including a database as disclosed in Dahlstrom, the method is more robust because multiple user suitability standards can be defined and stored for use on any computer where internet is being accessed. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include "storing the suitability standard in a database; and processing the database to determine the suitability standard."

Claim 22:

Hillis discloses the above method of claim 1 as noted above.

Hillis does not explicitly disclose, "the aggregate rating comprises one or more subject ratings, each associated with an evaluation criterion."

However, Dahlstrom discloses, "the aggregate rating comprises one or more subject [categories] ratings, each associated with an evaluation criterion." [See page 4, paragraph [0034] The web access settings defined at operation 218 in FIG. 2 are subdivided into multiple categories for better specification of the subject matter to which access is controlled.]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Hillis with that of Dahlstrom because both are related to evaluating and regulating content on the internet and by including one or more subject ratings, as disclosed in Dahlstrom, the method is detailed because it can be fine tuned for specific things to look for. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include disclose "the aggregate rating comprises one or more subject ratings, each associated with an evaluation criterion."

Claim 23:

Hillis and Dahstrom disclose the method of claim 22 as noted above.

Hillis does not explicitly disclose, "the evaluation criterion comprises at least one of sexual content, violent content, adult content, and targeted age."

However, Dahlstrom discloses, "the evaluation criterion comprises at least one of sexual content, violent content, adult content, and targeted age." [See page 4, paragraph [0034], the categories within specific control settings are defined include, but are not limited to 'Language', 'sex and nudity', 'violence'....]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Hillis with that of Dahlstrom because both are related to evaluating and regulating content on the internet and by including the particular types of subject ratings, as disclosed in Dahlstrom, the method is detailed because it can be fine tuned for specific things to look for. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to include disclose "the evaluation criterion comprises at least one of sexual content,

violent content, adult content, and targeted age."

9.   **Claims 8, 9, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

Hillis as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Perkins (US 7,072,888).

<u>Claim 8:</u>

Hillis discloses the method of claim 7 as noted above.

Hillis does not explicitly disclose, "at least one trust score is based on the geographical

location of the associated specific one of the plurality of evaluators."

However, Perkins discloses, "at least one trust score is based on the geographical location

of the associated specific one of the plurality of evaluators." [See column 3, lines 50-52, Profiles

may include information as to whether the user is a home or a business, geographic location,

typical spending, etc.]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the Hillis and Perkins because they both are related to feedback from users

and by including geographic location as disclosed in Perkins, the method can be more precise

delivering more accurate results. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would

have been motivated to include "at least one trust score is based on the geographical location of

the associated specific one of the plurality of evaluators."

<u>Claim 9:</u>

Hillis discloses the method of claim 7 as noted above.

Hillis does not explicitly disclose, "at least one trust score is based on one or more prior

content ratings received from the associated specific one of the plurality of evaluators."

However, Perkins discloses, "at least one trust score is based on one or more prior

content ratings received from the associated specific one of the plurality of evaluators." [See

column 12, lines 44 – 48, The profile not only contains information supplied by the user, but also

contains information pertaining to the user's previous searches, resources visited and ratings of

those resources.]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the Hillis and Perkins because they both are related to feedback from users

and by including prior content ratings as disclosed in Perkins, the method can be more precise

delivering more accurate results. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would

have been motivated to include "at least one trust score is based on one or more prior content

ratings received from the associated specific one of the plurality of evaluators."

Claim 15:

Hillis discloses the method of claim 7 as noted above.

Hillis does not explicitly disclose, "at least one of the plurality of trust scores is based on

at least one of the geographical location of the associated evaluator and prior rating information

received from the evaluator."

However, Perkins discloses, "at least one of the plurality of trust scores is based on at

least one of the geographical location of the associated evaluator and prior rating information"

(ratings of those resources) "received from the evaluator." [See column 3, lines 50-52 Profiles

may include information as to whether the user is a home or a business, geographic location,

typical spending, etc. And see column 12, lines 44-48 the profile not only contains information

supplied by the user, but also contains information supplied pertaining to the user's pervious

searches, resources visited and ratings of those resources.]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the Hillis and Perkins because they both are related to feedback from users

and by including geographic location as disclosed in Perkins, the method can be more precise

delivering more accurate results. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would

have been motivated to include "at least one of the plurality of trust scores is based on at least

one of the geographical location of the associated evaluator and prior rating information received

from the evaluator."

10.   **Claims 11, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable**

over Hillis as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Mascarenhas (US

2003/0014428).

Claim 11:

Hillis discloses the method of claim 7 as noted above.

Hillis does not explicitly disclose "at least one trust score is based on a rating deviation of

an evaluator, wherein the rating deviation is based on a comparison of (i) rating information for

one or more documents received from the evaluator and (ii) rating information for the one or

more documents received from one or more other evaluators."

However, Mascarenhas discloses, "at least one trust score is based on a rating deviation of an evaluator, wherein the rating deviation is based on a comparison of (i) rating information for one or more documents received from the evaluator and (ii) rating information for the one or more documents received from one or more other evaluators." [See page 3, paragraph [0044] An optional interface for acquiring profiles of experts: Input from each expert source may be normalized for certain variables, based on attributes measured for that expert source. For example, mean ratings and distributions collected and analyzed from each expert source may allow that expert's rating input to be expressed as standard deviations from the mean.]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to combine Hillis with that of Mascarenhas because both are related to rating content and by including the rating deviation as disclosed in Mascarenhas, a more accurate method is developed because the scores can be adjusted if they are consistently inconsistent with other evaluators. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include "at least one trust score is based on a rating deviation of an evaluator, wherein the rating deviation is based on a comparison of (i) rating information for one or more documents received from the evaluator and (ii) rating information for the one or more documents received from one or more other evaluators."

Claim 12:

Hillis discloses the method of claim 7 as noted above.

Hillis does not explicitly disclose "at least one trust score is based on a rating deviation of an evaluator, wherein the rating deviation is based on a comparison of (i) rating information for

one or more documents received from the evaluator and (ii) aggregate ratings for the one or more

documents."

However, Mascarenhas discloses "at least one trust score is based on a rating deviation of

an evaluator, wherein the rating deviation is based on a comparison of (i) rating information for

one or more documents received from the evaluator and (ii) aggregate ratings" [composite

rating] "for the one or more documents." [See page 3, paragraph [0044] An optional interface

for acquiring profiles of experts: Input from each expert source may be normalized for certain

variables, based on attributes measured for that expert source. For example, mean ratings and

distributions collected and analyzed from each expert source may allow that expert's rating input

to be expressed as standard deviations from the mean. And see page 3, paragraph [0041] A

composite rating may be computed from the mean of multiple ratings received under a single

taxonomic category.]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to combine Hillis with

that of Mascarenhas because both are related to rating content and by including the rating

deviation as disclosed in Mascarenhas, a more accurate method is developed because the scores

can be adjusted if they are consistently inconsistent with other evaluators. It is for this reason

that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include "at least one trust score

is based on a rating deviation of an evaluator, wherein the rating deviation is based on a

comparison of (i) rating information for one or more documents received from the evaluator and

(ii) rating information for the one or more documents received from one or more other

evaluators."

Claim 13:

Hillis discloses the method of claim 7 as noted above.

Hillis does not explicitly disclose, "the trust score of an evaluator is based on rating information previously received from the evaluator for one or more documents."

However, Mascarenhas discloses "the trust score of an evaluator is based on rating information" (expert's rating input) "previously received from the evaluator for one or more documents." [See page 3, paragraph [0044] An optional interface for acquiring profiles of experts: Input from each expert source may be normalized for certain variables, based on attributes measured for that expert source. For example, mean ratings and distributions collected and analyzed from each expert source may allow that expert's rating input to be expressed as standard deviations from the mean. Here, the trust score is based on prior ratings as well.]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to combine Hillis with that of Mascarenhas because both are related to rating content and by including the rating deviation as disclosed in Mascarenhas, a more accurate method is developed because the scores can be adjusted if they are consistently inconsistent with other evaluators. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include "the trust score of an evaluator is based on rating information previously received from the evaluator for one or more documents."

11.   **Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hillis as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Kirshenbaum et al. (hereinafter Kirshenbaum, US 2004/0199584).**

Claim 14:

Hillis discloses the method of claim 7 as noted above.

Hillis does not explicitly disclose, "determining one or more revised trust scores for one or more of the plurality of evaluators; and determining a revised aggregate rating [user models] based on the one or more revised trust scores. "

However, Kirshenbaum discloses "determining one or more revised trust scores" · (credibility) "for one or more of the plurality of evaluators" (users) ";and determining a revised aggregate rating based on the one or more revised trust scores." [See page 3, paragraph [0025] Those users (e.g., 12) who have previously provided reliable and useful feedback are given more credibility in their future feedback, and user models change more quickly in response to feedback from more credible users.]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention combine Hillis and Kirshenbaum because both are related to acquiring feedback or ratings on content and by including a revised trust score as taught in Kirshenbaum, the method is more accurate, taking into account that trust scores can change over time. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include "determining one or more revised trust scores for one or more of the plurality of evaluators; and determining a revised aggregate rating" (user models) "based on the one or more revised trust scores."

12.   **Claim 16 is are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hillis as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hosea et al. (hereinafter Hosea, US 2005/0204276).**

Claim 16:

Hillis discloses the method of claim 1 as noted above.

Hillis does not explicitly disclose "the document is an advertisement."

However, Hosea discloses "the document is an advertisement." [See page 5, paragraph

[0043] The components include but are not limited to text, images, advertisements and links to

other Web pages.]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine Hosea with Hillis because both are related to personalization of content and

by including advertisements as disclosed in Hillis, the method is optimized to produce better

results from the user by showing relevant advertisements. It is for this reason that one of

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include "the document is an

advertisement".

13.   **Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

Hillis as applied to claim 1 and 18 above, and further in view of Ahlander et al. (hereinafter

Ahlander, US 2005/0060404).

Claim 19:

Hillis discloses the limitations of claims 1 and 18 as noted above.

Hillis does not explicitly disclose "the plurality of evaluators are selected using a random

selection algorithm."

However, Ahlander discloses "the plurality of evaluators" [content rater] "are selected

using a random selection algorithm." [See page 3, paragraph [0037] A content rater can be

selected, for example randomly based on how long the content rater has been idle, based on policies or a rating service provider, etc.]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Hillis and Ahlander because both are related to evaluating content and by including the random selection as disclosed in Ahlander, the method can be more efficient by not needing to review particular criteria before assigning an evaluator. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include "the plurality of evaluators are selected using a random selection algorithm."

Claim 20:

Hillis discloses the limitations of claim 1 as noted above.

Hillis does not explicitly disclose "the criteria comprises a sensitivity score."

However, Ahlander discloses "the criteria comprises a sensitivity score" (threshold rating). [See page 4, paragraph [0050] Threshold rating 213 can be adjusted to increase the amount of content that is assigned a content rating or increase the accuracy associated with assigned content rating.]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Hillis and Ahlander because both are related to evaluating content and by including a sensitivity rating as disclosed in Ahlander, the method can be more precise by not allowing certain content through for particularly sensitive users, specifically on issues that are of increased importance. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include "the criteria comprises a sensitivity score."

14.   Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hillis as

applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Mascarenhas (US 2003/0014428).

<u>Claim 21:</u>

Hillis discloses the method of claim 1 as noted above.

Hillis does not explicitly disclose "receiving new rating information for the document;

and processing the new rating information to determine a revised rating associated with the

document."

However, Mascarenhas discloses "receiving new rating information for the document;

and processing the new rating information to determine a revised rating associated with the

document." (See page 14, paragraph [0224] Another user who would review the same document

and provide a similar rating could very well select different categories and different significance

ratings even for the same categories. In a preferred embodiment, these different significance

vector values are averaged and the resulting vector with the averages is saved with the document

along with a 'number of raters' value which is used to compute the new average.)

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to combine Hillis with

that of Mascarenhas because both are related to rating content and by including the revised rating

as disclosed in Mascarenhas, a more accurate rating is developed because the scores are adjusted

to consider the new evaluators. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would

have been motivated to include "receiving new rating information for the document; and

processing the new rating information to determine a revised rating associated with the

document."

15.   **Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hillis in view**

of Zigmond et al. (hereinafter Zigmond, US 6,698,020).

<u>Claim 35:</u>

Hillis discloses the following claimed limitations:

"selecting a plurality of evaluators to rate the document;"[0019, a rating system in which

a client queries a plurality of evaluation systems, according to an alternative embodiment of the

a client queries a plurality of evaluation systems. 0027, further discloses the evaluation profile

indicates which evaluation systems should be queried and how the ratings returned by the

evaluation systems should be combined to determine the combined rating. That is, evaluation

profile indicates which evaluation systems should be queried suggests the claimed "selecting a

plurality of evaluators" and "ratings returned by the evaluation systems" suggests the claimed

evaluators to rate a document.]

"passing the document to the plurality of evaluators for rating;" [0019, as in fig. 1, a

client 200 is communicatively coupled to a content server 500 to which it submits request for

content and from which it receives content.. Further disclosing 0048, the evaluation system

managed by the Centers for Disease control has not evaluated the article, and therefore does not

return a rating. Hence, Hillis shows that a document must be passed to an evaluator system in

order to rate a document. Otherwise, a rating is not returned. Ergo, "passing a the document"

(e.g. content is not rated unless an article is received by the evaluator system as disclosed as the

evaluation system managed by Centers for Disease control has not evaluated the article, and

therefore does not return a rating.) "to the plurality of evaluators for rating" (e.g. other evaluator

systems are able to provide a rating)]

"receiving content rating information from a plurality of evaluators" [0028, Each of the

evaluation systems that have evaluated the content of interest returns a rating, preferably

numeric.];

"determining an aggregate rating based on the rating information" [0030, The ratings

may be combined by any number of methods. In the case of numerical values, the ratings may be

combined in an averaging scheme, preferably a weighted averaging scheme, in which the user

values the opinion of the evaluation authority that manages each evaluation system. Here, Hillis

is referring to content in general and never specifically discloses advertising.];

Hillis does not explicitly disclose the content rating information being "associated with

an advertisement", "at least one of the plurality of advertisers is a partner advertisement listings

provider", "receiving a request for electronic delivery of one or more advertisements that satisfy

ad content criteria"; and "determining whether to deliver the first advertisement in response to

the request based on the ad content criteria and the aggregate rating".

However, **Zigmond** discloses the content rating information being "associated with an

advertisement" [see column 13, line 51 ...the content rating of the selected advertisement...],

"wherein at least one of the plurality of advertisers is a partner advertisement listings

provider" [See column 8, lines 12 – 29 Any number of entities may be the advertisement content

provider or, in other words, the party responsible for making the advertisements available to an

advertisement source 62 and an ad insertion device 60....content provider is the

advertiser...advertisement content provider is the same as the video programming content

provider...third party advertisement content provider...];

"receiving a request for electronic delivery of one or more advertisements that satisfy ad

content criteria" [See column 4, lines 45 – 48, At the appropriate time indicated by the triggering

event, the video programming feed is interrupted and the selected advertisement is displayed to

the viewer using a display screen... and see column 7, lines 30 – 32, An advertisement 59 that

has been selected according to any desired method is then displayed to the viewer using display

device.]; and

"determining whether to deliver the first advertisement" (select advertisement) "in

response to the request based on the ad content criteria" (parental lock code or other

indications..) "and the aggregate rating" (content rating of the selected advertisement). [See

column 13, lines 48-54 The ad selection criteria 83 could be used to select advertisements having

different content ratings depending on the content rating of the program being watched by the

viewer. Alternatively, the content rating of the selected advertisement may be coordinated with

the parental lock codes or other indications of preferred or permissible programming content

stored in the home entertainment system.]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the teachings of Hillis with that of Zigmond because Hillis is related to

evaluating content to provide a higher value or more pertinent product to the user and Zigmond

is also involved in providing more closely targeted content to the user, but more specifically

electronic advertisements. By including advertising content as disclosed in Zigmond, to the

aggregate rating as disclosed in Hillis the method would be more likely to generate higher

revenues for the advertisers by including better targeted advertising. Also, by including a partner advertisement listings provider, more potential ads can be made available and revenue can be generated from partners simply by displaying their ad when it is more relevant. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include the content rating information being "associated with an advertisement", "at least one of the plurality of advertisers is a partner advertisement listings provider", "receiving a request for electronic delivery of one or more advertisements that satisfy ad content criteria"; and "determining whether to deliver the first advertisement in response to the request based on the ad content criteria and the aggregate rating."

Response to Arguments

16.   Applicant's arguments filed 3/2/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's have asserted the following (lettered).

A. Remarks, page 13, that Hillis does not appear to send documents to evaluators for evaluation. That Hillis's application appears to query one or more evaluation systems for rating information regarding the document, and then aggregate the information returned to create a simplified rating score to display. That therefore, page 14, Hillis does not disclose the recited "selecting a plurality of evaluators to rate the document..." and "passing the document to the plurality of evaluators for rating..." That accordingly, the limitations of that claim 1, 32, 34, 29, 30, and 31 are not disclosed.

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees that "Hillis does not appear to send documents to evaluators for evaluation". 0048, discloses that In response to the query for a content rating, the evaluation system managed by the American Medical Association returns a value of -0.03, the evaluation system managed by the National Institutes of Health returns a value of -0.23, and the evaluation system managed by Nature magazine system returns a value of 0.15. The evaluation system managed by the Centers for Disease control has not evaluated the article, and therefore does not return a rating. Hence, Hillis shows that a document must be passed to an evaluator system in order to rate a document. Otherwise, a rating is not returned. Ergo, Hillis discloses "passing a the document" (e.g. content is not rated unless an article is received by the evaluator system suggested by the evaluation system managed by Centers for Disease control has not evaluated the article, and therefore does not return a rating.) "to the plurality of evaluators for rating" (e.g. other evaluator systems are able to provide a rating).

Furthermore, 0027, discloses the evaluation profile indicates which evaluation systems should be queried and how the ratings returned by the evaluation systems should be combined to determine the combined rating. That is, the evaluation profile indicates which evaluation systems should be queried suggests the claimed "selecting a plurality of evaluators" and ratings returned by the evaluation systems suggests the claimed "evaluators to rate a document".

Applicant's are reminded, the claims recite only "selecting a plurality of evaluators to rate the document" which Hillis discloses as seen on 0027, as the evaluation profile is capable of selecting a plurality of evaluation systems to rate a document. Applicant's are further reminded

that the claims recite only "passing the document to the plurality of evaluators for rating", which

Hillis also discloses as seen on 0048, as evaluation systems require the content in order to rate

the content as seen by no ratings when a content is not received. Hence, contents must be passed

to evaluation systems in order to even be rated. Accordingly, Hillis discloses the above

assertions made by Applicant's directed towards the claim limitations "selecting a plurality of

evaluators to rate the document..." and "passing the document to the plurality of evaluators for

rating..." Therefore, Applicant's assertions are unpersuasive.

B. Remarks, page 15, that Hillis does not disclose "transmitting the document to a plurality of

evaluators..." based on similar reasons in "A" with respect to claim 33.

In response, please see above part A.

C. Remarks page 16, that Hillis does not teach "selecting a plurality of evaluators to rate the

document.." and "passing the document to the plurality of evaluators for rating..." That similarly

Zigmond does not teach the above recited limitations. That therefore claim 35 is not anticipated.

In response, Hillis at the very minimum discloses the recited "selecting a plurality of

evaluators to rate the document.." and "passing the document to the plurality of evaluators for

rating..." as stated above in part A.

Furthermore, the examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicants that Zigmond would

not teach the above recited limitations either. The claim recites "passing the document to the

plurality of evaluators for rating...". Zigmond discloses col. 4 lines 19-21, ...a plurality of

advertisements from an advertisement source are received by a home entertainment system in the

household. Further disclosing, col. 13 lines 50-55 that content rating of the selected

advertisement may be coordinated with parental lock codes or other indications of preferred or

permissible programming content stored on the home entertainment system. Hence, Zigmond

surely suggests, "passing the document" (e.g. plurality of advertisements are received by a home

system) "to the plurality of evaluators for rating" (e.g. content rating of selected advertisement

stored on the home system). Accordingly, Applicant's assertions directed towards "passing the

document to the plurality of evaluators" against the Zigmond reference is unpersuasive.

Moreover, the claim limitation "selecting a plurality of evaluators to rate the document"

is also suggested by Zigmond. Since Zigmond discloses col. 4 lines 10-12 allows advertisers to

target individual viewers based on the needs and interests of individual viewers and households.

That is "selecting a plurality of evaluators" (e.g. target individuals) "to rate the document" (e.g.

based on needs and interests of individuals such as content rating disclosed above in col. 13

lines 50-55) is suggested by the Zigmond reference. Therefore, Zigmond also discloses,

"selecting a plurality of evaluators to rate the document" and Applicant's assertions directed

towards the Zigmond reference is unpersuasive.

In summary, Applicant's claimed limitations "passing the document to the plurality of

evaluators for rating" and "selecting a plurality of evaluators to rate the document" are still

found to be broad enough such that it would be reasonably suggested by Hillis or Zigmond

reference. Accordingly, the rejections are maintained.

Conclusion

17.   The prior art made of record listed on PTO-892 and not relied, if any, upon is considered

pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

18.   THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Contact Information

19.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Michael D. Pham whose telephone number is (571)272-3924.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael Pham   Cam Y. Truong
Art Unit 2167   Art Unit 2162
Examiner   Primary Examiner

John Cottingham
Art Unit 2167
Supervisor

JOHN COTTINGHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100